



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The  
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT WASHINGTON

THE act of Congress of January 4, 1889, incorporating the American Historical Association, makes Washington the official headquarters of the organization. Seven of its first eleven meetings were held in that city. When, as the result of a gently insurgent movement in 1895, the Association began to go regularly on circuit, an informal rule was posited, in accordance with which the society should hold its annual meetings, in triennial rotation, first in some Eastern city, then in some Western city, then in the capital. In reality, however, the rule has been more often infringed than followed. After 1895, the society did not again meet in Washington till 1901. In 1905 that city had a share in a meeting held mostly in Baltimore, in 1908 in a meeting held mostly in Richmond. From 1901 until December, 1915, there was no meeting held entirely in Washington.

In a sense, however, the Association when it meets in Washington meets *zu Hause*. It is entitled to meet here without local invitation, and the local members, though glad to join in extending such an invitation, may comfort themselves with the thought of these statutory rights, and of the various attractions of the national capital, whenever they wish to excuse to themselves the less elaborate character, in comparison with what has been extended in some other cities, of the welcome they were able to put forward. They share the gratitude felt by out-of-town members for the generous hospitality accorded, in very agreeable receptions, by the Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and by the Honorable and Mrs. John W. Foster. The Department of State included the officers of the society and the chairmen of its committees among those invited to the handsome reception given at the building of the Pan-American Union in honor of the representatives of American re-

publics convened, at the same time, in the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress. The Catholic University of America, with great generosity, invited the Association to luncheon in one of its interesting buildings at Brookland; the invitation deserves to be recorded with none the less gratitude though considerations of distance and of adjustment with other elements of the programme hindered the committee of local arrangements from acceptance.

The chairman of the committee on programme was Professor Charles D. Hazen. That of the committee of local arrangements was at first Dr. Herbert Putnam, afterward Dr. S. N. D. North. The work of the latter committee was invested with unusual difficulty because of the enormous influx into Washington of other scientific societies holding meetings at the same time. Not only did the American Economic Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Association for Labor Legislation, the American Society of International Law, the Naval History Society the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland, and some other societies with which the American Historical Association is more or less accustomed to be associated on these occasions, hold annual meetings at the same time and place, but an enormous gathering of scientists, of the United States and of Latin America, attended from December 27 to January 8 the sessions of the Second Pan-American Scientific Congress. Also, the Nineteenth International Congress of Americanists was held in Washington in the closing days of December.

With several of these societies, joint sessions were held. The most notable of these was that held in conjunction with the American Economic Association on the first evening. In this, Professor Walter F. Willcox of Cornell University, president of the economists, read his presidential address, on the Apportionment of Representatives;<sup>1</sup> and this was followed by the learned and thoughtful address, on Nationality and History, which Professor H. Morse Stephens delivered as president of the American Historical Association, and which we had the pleasure of printing in our last issue.

An agreeable feature of another session was the reading of a letter of greeting from Lord Bryce, the sole honorary member of the American Historical Association, who when it last met in Washington had, with Lady Bryce, welcomed it with cordial hospitality at the British Embassy. He urged upon the attention of American historians the duty of making the contribution, which their unique position during the great war gave them the opportunity to make,

<sup>1</sup> Printed in the supplement to the *American Economic Review* for March (VI. 3 ff.).

toward writing the history of its causes and developments. He also adverted to the historical aspects of nationalism, which was to be the theme of one of the sessions, and to the partially changed light in which British Liberals, after the experiences of sixty years, were now obliged to view the principle of nationality.

By a greater extension than has been usual, the meeting occupied four days, from Tuesday, December 28, to Friday, December 31, inclusive. Headquarters were at the New Willard Hotel. The programme seemed to most members excellent and, spread over four days, was marked by a happy avoidance of congestion, though some of the good effect was undone by the excessive concourse of other societies. The registration was 430.

Among the sessions having a general character, as distinguished from those devoted to specific fields of history, one stands out as of especial practical importance, the meeting held in the interest of a National Archive Building in Washington. The movement for the erection of such a building, and for ending the discreditable conditions now existing in respect to government archives in Washington, has now been for eight years pursued by the Association. Ultimate success is certain, and in such form that, without exaggeration, we are destined to have the finest national archive building in the world. The erection of such a building has been authorized, but no appropriation has yet been made for anything beyond the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates. In the hope that appropriations for construction may be obtained this winter, an impressive demonstration of needs and possibilities was arranged for the first afternoon session, a session held in the Continental Hall of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and presided over by Senator Poindexter, who has been the leader in all legislative promotion of the object. It was a joint session of various interested societies. Professor Frank W. Taussig, professor of political economy in Harvard University, spoke of the Value of Archives to the Student, Dr. Gaillard Hunt, chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, of the Value of Archives to the Administration, the former giving various illustrations of the use of archival materials in scholarly researches, the latter dwelling upon the dependence of government on precedent and its consequent need of well-preserved and well-ordered archives. In the four remaining papers, which were accompanied by interesting lantern illustrations, Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh, of Iowa, set forth many examples of what American states, cities, and business corporations have done for the preservation of their records, and of the

work of the Association's Public Archives Commission and of the archive departments or commissions of states; Mr. Waldo G. Leland, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, described and showed whatever was most apposite and interesting among the archival buildings and arrangements of Europe; Mr. Leo F. Stock, of the same institution, exposed with telling photographs the shocking conditions at present prevailing in the various buildings in Washington; and Mr. Louis A. Simon, of the office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, exhibited and explained the architectural studies made in that office for the proposed building, especially the strikingly handsome design which is likely to be selected.

The annual conference of historical societies was presided over by Mr. Frank H. Severance, of the Buffalo Historical Society. The secretary, Mr. Augustus H. Shearer, made the usual report of such statistics as he had been able to obtain from a considerable number of societies, as to accessions and other progress during the past year. The main theme of the conference, however, was the acquisition, the care, and the use of the Papers of Business Houses, in Historical Work. Dr. Milo M. Quaife, of the Wisconsin Historical Society, in a well-considered paper, discussed some of the problems of the collection of such papers, especially in a Western state. They do not come in without solicitation. They are often surrendered with hesitation, sometimes because standards of business ethics formerly acted upon may now seem improper, sometimes because private interests of the present time give ground for reluctance, in a region where few parts of economic history lie remote from our own day. But the Wisconsin fur-trade was nearly a closed chapter when Dr. Thwaites began his great collection of materials upon it, and the Wisconsin lumber industry will soon advance into the same category. Professor Ulrich B. Phillips, of Michigan, followed with remarks upon the papers of systematically managed Southern plantations; Governor L. Bradford Prince, of the New Mexico Historical Society, with remarks on the Álvarez papers and other documents of business houses flourishing in Santa Fé just before and just after the American occupation; Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, of the New York Public Library, with suggestions as to coping with the excessive bulk of collections of business papers—for instance, encouraging their preservation by local chambers of commerce.

Another session having general objects in view was the conference of teachers of history, in which the main matter propounded for discussion was the question, whether more precise definition is

desirable either for college entrance requirements or for general courses in secondary schools. Remarks were made by Dr. James Sullivan, Miss Margaret McGill, and Professors Herbert D. Foster, Henry E. Bourne, Eugene M. Violette, and Edgar Dawson. There was general agreement in favor of a more precise definition. The Association's Committee on History Teaching, of which Professor William S. Ferguson, of Harvard, is chairman, was authorized to prepare such a definition, upon the basis of a list of essential topics to be emphasized and a list of collateral readings.

Turning now to those numerous papers that dealt with restricted fields of history, it may conduce to clearness if we take them up in the chronological order of their subjects, rather than in the partly casual order into which they were thrown by the exigencies of programme-making.

In ancient history the chosen theme was the Economic Causes of International Rivalries and Wars in Ancient Times. There were two main papers, by Professor Ferguson and by Professor George W. Botsford, of Columbia University. The tracing of ancient Greek wars to economic causes was, said the former, a procedure not unknown to Greek thought, and many facts can be adduced in support of the contention. Without ignoring these, the origins of the old Greek wars are in fact to be sought in many causes besides the mere collision of economic forces—the same varied causes which in all modern history have bred wars between the large states of Europe—and as in the one case so in the other, wars may finally be checked by higher organization and developed policy. After an acute analysis of the causes of the Peloponnesian War and of the war of 395 B.C., Professor Ferguson summed up. "To conclude: there were many different causes of war in ancient Greece. Each nation was a complex of ideas as well as of men; of hopes, fears, and memories, as well as of desires; of customs as well as of institutions; yet through them all live wires of internationalism ran, transmitting both war and peace. There were as many possibilities of wars as there were points of contact. They fought for land, they fought for trade; they fought to gratify the vanity or ambition of leaders or kings, and they fought to gratify their own pride; they fought through fear and they fought for revenge. They never fought, I think, because they liked fighting."<sup>2</sup>

With a similar unwillingness to attribute constant and predominating influence to any one cause, Professor Botsford re-

<sup>2</sup> For the full text of the paper, see the *Military Historian and Economist* for April.

viewed the origins of various Roman wars. Economic factors operated to some extent, but many other motives, motives of defense, for instance, and even individual ambition, played quite as frequent a part. Nearly all the wars of the imperial period were either directly defensive, or waged for the securing of more defensible boundaries or for bringing, in other ways, increased security to the empire.

In the discussion which followed, Professor Tenney Frank, of Bryn Mawr, laid emphasis upon the frequent difficulty of substantiating the surmise that a given war, in ancient history, was caused by economic pressure, but he developed an interesting instance of its indirect action, in the case of the Second Punic War, by showing how large a part in causing that war was played, not by any economic motives working directly on the Roman mind, but by the commercial rivalries of Carthage and Marseilles in Spain. Dr. A. E. R. Boak, of the University of Michigan, discussed mainly the evidences to be derived from Isocrates, explaining the reasons for laying especial value on his statements, and concluding that, in the wars of his period, even against Persia, economic motives could never have been foremost. Similar conclusions were sustained by Dr. R. V. D. Magoffin, of the Johns Hopkins University.

The session devoted to medieval history had as its especial subject Medieval Colonization. It was opened by a paper by Professor James Westfall Thompson, of Chicago, elaborating a theme to which he had devoted a few pages of his paper at the Boston meeting,<sup>3</sup> that of East German Colonization. On the one hand he endeavored to explain the economic and social motives which, in settled western Germany, led small landowners and the dispossessed to retire before the extension of large proprietorship and the feudal system, and to take refuge and seek free land and carve out new fortunes in the thinly populated lands lying to the eastward. On the other hand he traced, from Charlemagne's time to the thirteenth century, the development of successive frontiers and the progressive acquisition of one Slavic area after another. In the time of Charlemagne the frontier of settlement barely reached beyond the Rhine. Under the Saxon emperors it was extended to the Aller and the Saale, to Bamberg and the mountains of Styria. During the Franconian period, Wendish revolts in Nordalbingia and Slavic resistance elsewhere prevented farther advance, but under the first Hohenstaufens the forward pressure of the Germans carried them quickly to the occupation of Mecklenburg, Brandenburg, and Pomerania. The

<sup>3</sup> *American Historical Review*, XVIII. 494-497.

machinery for the encouragement of settlement, the system of rectangular survey, the methods of economic exploitation, were effectively described, and the analogies between the eastward movement of the Germans and the westward movement characteristic of American history were shown to be much more than superficial.

The Problems of Anglo-Saxon Settlement were treated by Professor Howard L. Gray, of Bryn Mawr, with an eye mainly to the social aspects of the early village. Using place-names as a chief source of knowledge, and taking five typical shires for comparison, he showed that villages having names in *-ing-* and *-ham* represent a first or eastern stratum of colonization, those in *-ton* a second or midland stratum, and those in *-ley* a third or western. Entering particularly into the consideration of names in *-ing-*, like Billingham or Harlington, he showed that the attribution of a patronymic meaning to that syllable had an insecure foundation, that it sometimes signified "hill" and perhaps as often meant "belonging to" as "descendants of". Evidence, from such sources, for a democratic organization of early Anglo-Saxon society, such as historians of the last generation had confidently imagined, was weak; quasi-manorial or aristocratic organization was more likely.

In a paper on the Genoese as Colonizers, Dr. Eugene H. Byrne, of Wisconsin, made it plain that their experiments in colonization must be studied in close connection with the commercial and political conditions in the commune of Genoa itself. In the twelfth century the city was governed by a small group of families who also monopolized the foreign trade, especially that with Syria; they placed various members of a single family, the Embriaci, in control of the colonies in Syria. This family acquired almost complete independence of the commune except in Acre; the branch of the family holding Acre, however, continued to reside in Genoa, employing salaried administrators for this colony. About 1190 this group of families lost their political grasp in Genoa; with it their commercial monopoly disappeared. The trade with Syria was thrown open to the people; with the establishment of a more centralized government at home, based on greater democracy, the colonies in Syria, newly re-established after the successes of the third crusade, were for the first time placed under the direct control of the commune through two *consules et vicecomites* appointed for a limited term by the city government, now under a podestà. The colonial experiments of the Genoese in Syria in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries enabled them to erect a great colonial power in Pera and the Black Sea region after the restoration of the Greek Empire.



Lastly, in a paper on Monastic Colonization in Spain, Dr. Constantine E. McGuire, of Washington, set forth the process by which the Spanish monastic orders had provided for the industrial occupation of lands won back from the Mohammedans in Central Spain. A very substantial body of material, it was pointed out, is to be found already in print. Spanish investigators have traditionally been interested in all the evidence obtainable bearing upon the legal position and public activities of the Church, the crown, and various classes and corporations. Innumerable instances could be cited from these printed data of the manner in which the religious orders, contemplative, military, or mendicant, resolutely went at the task of developing deserted valleys into communities capable of serving as barriers against the infidel and the desert. The process was greatly helped by the effectiveness of the right of asylum, an immunity from jurisdiction long since firmly buttressed by the sanction of ancient theological and legal traditions.

The monotony which sometimes besets congresses for paper-reading was broken up in the case of the session devoted primarily to modern European history by the happy expedient of having but one paper, by Professor James H. Robinson, of Columbia University, to which more amplitude than the usual twenty minutes was allowed, and to which the other papers or addresses of the morning should bear the relation of comment or criticism. Professor Robinson's topic was the Historical Aspects of Nationalism. The aspects considered by those who discussed his paper were not always historical but all were interesting and suggestive. He pointed out, first, that nationalism is one of those "mystical entities" or corporate emotions with which the historical student is familiar. These are spontaneously generated because of man's pronounced social instincts, and are reflections of his anxiety to be part of a larger body in whose achievements and aspirations he can share. The next question is, what is there novel in national spirit as we know it to-day? This suggested a review of social entities familiar in history—the family, tribe, city, guild, and the like—and of the corporate loyalties and responsibilities they imply. The attitude of Cicero toward patriotism, of contemporaries toward the Roman Empire, the emergence of the "national state" from feudal conditions, were passed in review. The latter phenomenon did not produce necessarily any national feeling in our modern sense, for the central idea was rather that of the fidelity of subjects to their king than that of citizens toward their state. Modern national feeling is a by-product of another mystical entity, democracy, and was power-

fully furthered by the work of the French Revolution and of Napoleon. Fichte's *Reden* gave the first startling example of the old sentiment in its new form. The way was indicated by which the student could trace, in the German and other nations, the development and cultivation of such emotions in the nineteenth century.

The more vital problem, however, is the emergence of modern internationalism. This runs counter to the primitive and uncritical sentiments which underlie nationalism. Internationalism demands clear thinking and conscious adjustment, while nationalism is after all the primitive tribal sentiment, and is now associated with various gross misapprehensions about inherent racial differences which anthropologists, psychologists, and historians are busy dissipating.<sup>4</sup>

In opening the discussion of this paper, Professor Edward B. Krehbiel, of Stanford University, confined himself to the problem of economic self-interest as the foundation of the nation. At their first formation nations were groups plainly isolated from other national groups and having obviously separate economic interests, which the monarch easily represented; but what is the rôle of economic self-interest in this present world, in which nations are so interpenetrated and interwoven? Extra-national commercialism has called into existence many undertakings which operate outside the nation when prosperous, but claim its protection and aid in stress or competition. National competition, however, will be sustained by democracies only so long as the profits from it are believed to exceed its costs. When that is no longer believed, nationalism will have lost what basis it still has in the material world and will be altogether an ideal. The modern tendency is certainly toward ever-enlarging co-operative units (*e. g.*, the Zollverein).

Adverting first to the standing difficulty of defining "nationality" and "nationalism", Professor William T. Laprade, of Trinity College, North Carolina, dissented from Mr. Robinson as to nationalism being a product of democracy, for in England and France certainly nationalism preceded democracy. The sentiment, and the institutions accompanying it, appeared to the speaker to have been born of the practical struggles made by each generation to solve its peculiar problems, to have been the product of natural evolution rather than of conscious adjustment; and the next stage, internationalism, would, he imagined, come about in a similar manner, because by means of it problems could be solved, needs be met, which were found to baffle solution under nationalism. Meanwhile, a thousand points in the history of nationalism called for closer historical investigation.

<sup>4</sup> The paper may be expected to appear soon in the *Century Magazine*.

Professor Thomas F. Moran, of Purdue University, also regarded nationalism as the product of so many various forces, acting through so many various conflicts, that the transition into a broader nationalism, equivalent to internationalism, was fairly to be expected. Major John Bigelow interposed a caution against regarding internationalism as a substitute for nationality; to his mind it was but a transition from nationality to a larger nationality (*e. g.*, the Zollverein), and carried no evidence of progress toward any higher synthesis. Upon the basis of observation of the Balkan nationalities, Miss Hester D. Jenkins urged that, in so far as education and propaganda had been the leading factors in creating nationalism, they might well be relied upon to bring internationalism forward, ultimately, into equal or even prevailing power.

An allied theme, the Growth of Nationalism in the British Empire, was the subject of another session, which was held in conjunction with the American Political Science Association. The paper on this topic which was read by Professor George M. Wrong, of Toronto, we hope to be able to present before long in the pages of this journal. He was followed by Mr. A. Maurice Low, Washington correspondent of the *Morning Post*, who first outlined the historic development of British opinion respecting colonies, from that which produced the American war of independence, the notion that colonies existed solely for the benefit of the mother-country, down to that which underlies the present British Empire; and then described, with eloquence and force, the impressive proofs afforded by the present war, that an empire composed of practically independent nations may through the force of national feeling acquire unexampled solidity, local freedom and self-government only strengthening the bonds of imperial unity.

Professor George B. Adams, of Yale, began the discussion of the two papers with remarks which laid their main emphasis on three great landmarks in the simultaneous growth of local independence and imperial unity: first, the turn of feeling and policy which ensued upon the definitions, effected in Gladstone's first ministry, of the relations between the colonies and the home government; secondly, the South African War; and thirdly, the present war, with the striking response of the oversea dominions to the empire's need. Professor Charles M. Andrews, of Yale, contrasted the inflexible attitude of English statesmen of the eighteenth century, in relation to the colonial régime, with the policy of frank concessions which had produced the affectionate loyalty pervading the present empire. Major Bigelow questioned whether the solidarity

and strength of that empire had not been exaggerated. Professor Morse Stephens, in closing the discussion, dwelt upon the part played by poetry and sentiment as foundations of its strength.

Another paper of publicistic character, read in a joint session with one of the sections of the Pan-American Scientific Congress, was that of Hon. Henry White, formerly American ambassador in Rome and in Paris, on Diplomacy and Politics; it was a plea, based partly on instances in recent history, for a better system of appointment of our diplomatic representatives in foreign countries, and for the elimination of party politics from our relations with the other nations of the world.

Of the papers relating distinctively to American history, the earliest in date of theme was that of Mr. William H. Babcock, of Washington, on Indications of Visits of White Men to America before Columbus, a paper read before a session held jointly with the Congress of Americanists. After reviewing the familiar stories of early Irish and Norse visits to American shores and the evidences as to the island called Brazil, Mr. Babcock, with the aid of many lantern-slides from fourteenth-century and fifteenth-century maps, set forth his opinion that a Breton expedition at least approached our coast before 1367, that some navigator from the Iberian peninsula almost certainly coasted along Cuba and a few of its neighbors not later than 1435, and that some other navigator perhaps made the crossing from Cape Verde to South America as early as 1448.

Dr. Frances G. Davenport, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, upon the basis of long-continued study of the early treaties of European powers relative to America, read a paper on America and European Diplomacy, to 1648. The main purpose of the paper was to describe the chief diplomatic arrangements which, in the period named, France, England, and the United Provinces respectively concluded with Portugal and Spain with regard to American trade and territory, of both of which Spain and Portugal claimed a monopoly. In the first period, extending to the treaty of Cateau-Cambr sis in 1559, France was the most formidable opponent of that monopoly. After prolonged negotiations in the years preceding, in which the French claimed access to the Spanish Indies, the treaty named was concluded without mention of the Indies, but with oral agreement, apparently, that Spaniards and Frenchmen encountering one another west of the prime meridian should be free to treat one another as enemies. During the wars of religion in France, and until the Spanish-English treaty of 1604, the lead in efforts to break the monopoly fell to England. In that treaty the

provision respecting navigation to the Indies was finally so worded as to be differently interpreted by the two parties, but England could proceed to colonize Virginia. From 1604 to 1648 the chief rôle in the contest was sustained by the Dutch. In the twelve years' truce of 1609 the States General secured a concession of the India trade, veiled by circumlocutions. The treaty of 1648 conceded in explicit terms the right to trade and acquire territory in America. The assailants of the Spanish-Portuguese monopoly in these three successive periods—Jean Ango and his pilots, Hawkins and Drake, the Dutch West India Company—each played a similar part, each represented a syndicate of capitalists and had governmental support, and each derived its profits partly from trade and partly from booty.

An interesting paper by Professor Bernard Moses, of the University of California, on the Social Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in South America, endeavored to depict the transition which, from the settled social order established by Spain in the seventeenth century, engendered the new and revolutionary society of the early nineteenth century and through it produced independence and the new republics. Stirrings of a new spirit were discernible in the early years of the eighteenth century. The creole class, of colonial birth, had greatly increased in numbers and intelligence. Spain's rigid system of colonial government, taking no account of the great differences of character among the inhabitants of the several political divisions, caused her government to become gradually more ineffective, and permitted the growth of a creole-mestizo party of opposition, and the development in it of community self-consciousness and a certain sense of independence. The French régime under Louis XIV. introduced elements of liberality; their suppression after his death, and the restoration of the old rigid and exclusive Spanish system, fortified discontent. The official class, bound by ties of privilege to a reactionary position, became more and more separate from the new society, the latter more and more conscious of the separation. The social revolution, on its spiritual side, became complete; at the turn of the century it proceeded to establish itself in outward fact.

Another historical paper in the Americanist session, valuable in a different sort, but defying brief summary, was that of the Right Reverend Dr. Charles W. Currier, formerly bishop of Matanzas, now bishop of Hetalonia *in partibus*, on the Sources of Cuban Ecclesiastical History.<sup>5</sup>

The account of the Indians and their Culture as described in

<sup>5</sup> But the papers read before the Nineteenth Congress of Americanists are soon to be all printed in an official volume.

Swedish and Dutch Records from 1614 to 1644, presented to the Americanists by Dr. Amandus Johnson, of the University of Pennsylvania, was historical in character as well as ethnological, dealing chiefly with the White and Black Minquas (Susquehannas and Eries) of Iroquoian stock.

In the field of Revolutionary history, there were three papers, one by Dr. David J. Hill, formerly ambassador to Germany, entitled a Missing Chapter of Franco-American History, one by Rear-Admiral French E. Chadwick on the Operations of Admiral Count de Grasse, and a report by Captain Hollis C. Clark, U. S. A., of his work under the act for collecting military and naval records of the Revolutionary War with a view to their publication. Admiral Chadwick was absent on account of illness, and only a part of his paper was read. This and Captain Clark's report, and those of Captain Rees and Professor Fish mentioned below, were presented in the joint session held with the Naval History Society.

Dr. Hill's paper dealt with the relations of Franklin to the French constitutionalists. In the flood of French eulogies published at the time of his death in 1790, by far the leading place belongs to those written by the constitutionalists, such as those of Mirabeau and Condorcet. The royalists and democrats surveyed his character and career coolly and critically. To the constitutionalists he was the chief political thinker of the age, the discoverer, we may almost say, of the foundations of society. Franklin had in fact been a member, and had been designated as the "Venerable", of the society of the Nine Sisters, an esoteric school of political thought in France, the first school of constitutionalism on the continent of Europe. This society had a great influence on the constitutionalist movement in France, and on the French Revolution in its first period. Its members played an important part in giving both shape and substance to that earlier phase of the Revolution; and much influence upon it, by means of his association with them in this society, and their regard for him, must be attributed to Franklin. The paper will appear later in this journal.

Admiral Chadwick's narrative, based in part upon the papers of Count de Grasse, which he is editing for the Naval History Society, traced the history of the consultations between Washington and Rochambeau in New England and Grasse in the West Indies, the voyages of Grasse and Barras to the Chesapeake, the ill-adjusted movements of Hood and Graves toward a junction, the battle of September 5, 1781, and its happy effects upon the Yorktown campaign. The presence and work of this French fleet gave America

her independence. Yet Admiral Chadwick showed easily, from the letters, signals, and movements of both naval commanders, how imperfectly they had grasped their true objective, to give support and bring decisive victory to their respective parties in the land campaign. Graves in particular, who might have been victorious if he had promptly attacked the van of the French fleet while the remainder was emerging from the Capes, was hidebound in adherence to the old Fighting Instructions; and though Hood criticized his conduct with severity, it is impossible to avoid the conviction that he himself did not do his full duty as a loyal subordinate.

The undertaking of which Captain Clark had had charge, under the War Department, and whose results he described, was provided for in an act of Congress of March 2, 1913, passed mainly through the endeavors of the Society of the Cincinnati. The appropriation made, \$32,000, was a small one, for the magnitude of the object. The War Department, the Navy Department, the Library of Congress, and some other governmental institutions in Washington, have large masses of military and naval records and correspondence of the period from 1775 to 1783, and the War Department had some twenty years before transcribed the principal Revolutionary records of Delaware, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, and Vermont. Therefore work under the new appropriation was naturally turned toward the archives of other states. With the money in hand, it was deemed wise to confine operations to three states, Massachusetts, Virginia, and North Carolina. At the request of the two departments, the American Historical Association appointed an advisory committee, with Major Bigelow as chairman, and this committee recommended searchers and drafted instructions. The copying was done by photography, experiment being made of various methods, which the director described in his paper. He also described the experimental campaign of publicity carried on in Virginia, but concluded that the best results in respect to papers in private hands were to be obtained rather by the quiet and patient efforts of well-informed and tactful searchers. The two departments co-operated in the work, the Navy Department appointing its librarian, Mr. Charles W. Stewart, to act on its part, in conjunction with Captain Clark. In all, 30,522 prints were collected under the appropriation—substantially twenty thousand in Massachusetts, six thousand in Virginia, four thousand in North Carolina. In no one of the three were these results exhaustive, but Congress has for the present declined to make any further appropriation.

Other papers of a military character were those of Captain

Robert I. Rees, U. S. A., on Bladensburg, of Professor Carl R. Fish, on the Organization of the Wisconsin Volunteers in 1861, and of Mr. Oswald G. Villard, on the Submarine and Torpedo in the Blockade of the Confederacy.<sup>6</sup> Captain Rees described the British expeditionary force and its invasion, the efforts of the American government to meet it, the difficulties which these efforts encountered because of the loose control which the federal government had over state militia, the course of the fighting, the devastation of Washington, and the other results of the battle. He also discussed briefly the causes for the failure of the defense.

Professor Fish's contribution was a detailed study of the way in which the first Wisconsin troops of the Civil War were actually brought together, equipped, taken care of, drilled, and finally turned over to the national government. The results were good in the number of men provided, in their quality, and, relatively speaking, in their preparation. This was due to no special excellence of organization, but to the skill and attention of the governor and the spontaneous activity of the localities. The villages provided the companies, the state organized the regiments, the national government then took them over.

Mr. Villard showed how the credit for the first effective use of torpedoes and submarines in naval warfare belongs to the Confederates, blockaded by sea as is the German Empire to-day. By July 22, 1861, floating mines had been found in the Potomac and at Hampton Roads. The feeling against the use of such devices was at first very bitter. A naval torpedo service had been created as early as June 10, and placed in charge of Commander Matthew F. Maury, C. S. N., the distinguished scientist, who in the next June mined the James River, after the battle of Seven Pines, then sailed to Europe, to return, too late, with abundant torpedo supplies. It was at best a hastily improvised service, lacking much necessary material and supplying its place by ingenious contrivances of remarkable variety; yet, from first to last, four monitors, three iron-clads, nine gunboats, seven transports, and six colliers and tugs fell victims to torpedoes or mines, with loss of many lives, while the deterrent effect of such weapons was of course also extensive. Mr. Villard likewise gave an account of the Confederate use of submarines in the defense of Charleston harbor.

Of the papers which related to the civil history of the United States, two bore upon themes in economic history, that of Professor Louis B. Schmidt, of the Iowa State College of Agriculture, on the

<sup>6</sup> Those of Captain Rees and Professor Fish are, it is understood, to appear in the *Military Historian and Economist*.



Economic History of American Agriculture as a Field for Study, and that of Dr. Victor S. Clark, of the economic department of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, on the Influence of Manufactures upon Political Sentiment in the United States from 1820 to 1860.<sup>7</sup> Dr. Schmidt rightly declared that the economic history of American agriculture had not received its due share of attention, and that it was essential to any well-balanced view of national progress in a country which from the beginning had consisted mainly of rural communities. Broadly conceived, it should include not only the evolution of agriculture in the different sections, and the problems engaging the attention of the rural population in the different periods, but the relation of agriculture to other industries, and in short the whole life of the rural population and the influence of our agricultural development on our national existence. After describing more fully the reasons for the study of this portion of American history, Dr. Schmidt stated some of the problems which await the labors of the historian: the history of the public lands; the history of specific leading agricultural industries; the economic history of agriculture by states or given regions; the history of farmers' organizations, of agricultural labor, of farm machinery; the influence of immigration on the development of agriculture; the transportation of agricultural products; markets and prices; the relation of agriculture to financial legislation, and the like.

Dr. Clark began with the organization of the new manufacturing interest as a political force a few years after 1815, and with the efforts it made to strengthen the national government, because the federal power alone could protect domestic industries. It soon aroused an opposition based ostensibly upon constitutional theories, but in fact upon the discordant economic interests of the different parts of the country. These would have been sufficient, without the presence of slavery, to explain the different attitudes of the sections toward public policies, and consequently their different theories of government. For a time manufacturing, in increasing the economic diversity of the country, added to its sectional discord; but, as the most highly co-operative form of production and the form most dependent upon an efficient government for its prosperity, it ultimately tended to produce closer and firmer political relations within the state. Even before the Civil War the economic purpose of the state was again attaining recognition. The unity and strength of the government were seen to affect directly the welfare of industrial workers and employers. The growing interdependence of society was manifested in production through the new organization

<sup>7</sup> To appear later in this journal.

and expansion of manufactures. Political institutions responded to the change by extending their authority and functions.

In an address which could be regarded as a by-product of the thoroughgoing studies he has been making toward his biography of Chief Justice Marshall, Senator Beveridge described the sources he had unearthed for such a life, and especially its earlier portion, and, with extracts and comments, showed how they illuminated his character as a young lawyer, as a statesman, as a lover, and as a friend.

Miss Ida M. Tarbell's paper on the Education of the American Woman in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century first described those private schools and academies for girls with which the century opened, and adverted to the important influence of Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*; she then proceeded to the endeavors of Emma Willard to obtain state support for female education in New York, of Mary Lyon to maintain at Mount Holyoke a privately endowed school of high grade, and of Catherine Beecher in the West, narrated the beginnings of coeducational collegiate instruction at Oberlin and Antioch colleges, and traced the movement till the time when the high schools of Boston and New York were thrown open to girls.

Finally, a paper by Professor William I. Hull, of Swarthmore College, on the Monroe Doctrine as applied to Mexico, took up in turn the three fields in which the doctrine had been applied, those of territory, trade, and government, and showed how it had operated in each to exclude European domination, then to assert the paramount interests of the United States, and finally to subordinate those interests to a wider Pan-Americanism. He urged that this last movement should not be allowed to hinder the new internationalism of our time from developing and strengthening of institutions.

Not a few of the papers, it will have been seen, had a more or less close relation to the international affairs of the present day, but nowhere was there manifested in the discussion any other than that pacific and considerate spirit which is appropriate to the historical profession. A similar temper prevailed, in general, in the business meeting. Interest in that meeting, and expectancy in regard to the report of the Committee of Nine appointed a year before "to consider the constitution, organization, and procedure of the Association, and the relationship between the Association and the *American Historical Review*", had the chief part in bringing about the exceptionally large attendance at this Washington meeting; but interest and expectancy were shown to be compatible with patience and good temper.

Before the report of that committee could be reached, however, the usual series of annual reports had to be presented. The secretary stated the total membership to be 2956, a net gain during the year of 43 members. The treasurer reported net receipts of \$10,728 during the year, net disbursements of \$10,457, and assets of \$27,062, a gain of \$264. At his request a finance committee of three, distinct from the financial committee of the Executive Council, was appointed by the Association to examine the finances and report at the next annual meeting. The secretary of the Council reported the election of Professors Ephraim Emerton and Claude H. Van Tyne as members of the Board of Editors of this journal, in the place of Professors Burr and Turner. He also reported the list of committee assignments and the budget drawn up by the Council. These are printed as appendixes to this article, as likewise a summary of the treasurer's report, and all important votes of the Association and of the Council.

Reports were made as follows: for the Pacific Coast Branch by Professor Ephraim D. Adams, delegate of the branch; for the Public Archives Commission by its chairman, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits; for the Committee on Publications by Professor Max Farrand; for the Committee on History in Schools by Professor William S. Ferguson; for the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* by Professor Edward P. Cheyney; and for the Advisory Board of Editors of the *History Teacher's Magazine* by Professor Henry Johnson. Besides these reports by chairmen, statements less formal were made for committees whose chairmen were absent—the Historical Manuscripts Commission and the General Committee. On report and recommendation from the Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize, that prize was awarded to Dr. Theodore C. Pease for an essay entitled "The Leveller Movement"; the committee made honorable mention of an essay on Napoleon's System of Licensed Navigation, 1806-1814, by Dr. Frank E. Melvin. The Committee on the Military History Prize deemed it inexpedient to award the prize to any of the present contestants.

The chairman of the Committee of Nine, Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, being absent on account of illness, its report was presented by Professor William A. Dunning as vice-chairman. It was somewhat late when this report was reached, but it had been circulated in print on the preceding day. The recommendations made by the committee are presented in an appendix to this article. That the Association had so happy an issue from a meeting to which not a few members had looked forward with anxiety is, in the judg-

ment of the present writer, mainly due to the painstaking labors of this committee and its judicious recommendations, which seemed on the whole to produce general contentment. The committee proposed three amendments to the constitution (chiefly relating to the composition of the Council), four by-laws (chiefly relating to elections), four recommendations as to procedure, and two resolutions regarding the *American Historical Review*. There was unfortunately too little time for immediate discussion. The constitutional amendments, in accordance with existing constitutional provision, were referred to the next annual meeting. The same course was taken with the by-laws. The recommendations as to procedure were adopted at once. With respect to this journal, the Association voted in principle that full ownership and control should be vested in the Association, but left it to a committee to outline the needful arrangements and report them to the next annual meeting.

The election of officers was conducted in accordance with the plan proposed by Professor Hull's committee a year before, and the same plan was continued for use in 1916. Professor Charles H. McIlwain, chairman of the Committee on Nominations, reported for that committee the following nominations: for president, Professor George L. Burr; for first vice-president, Mr. Worthington C. Ford; for second vice-president, Mr. William R. Thayer; for secretary, Mr. Waldo G. Leland; for treasurer, Dr. Clarence W. Bowen; for curator, Mr. A. Howard Clark; for secretary of the council, Professor Evarts B. Greene; for additional members of the council, Dr. Frederic Bancroft and Professors Eugene C. Barker, Guy S. Ford, Charles H. Haskins, Ulrich B. Phillips, and Lucy M. Salmon. He further presented the name of Professor Samuel B. Harding, nominated by petition. Dr. Frederic Bancroft's name was, at his request, withdrawn. The others who have been named were unanimously elected. The following were chosen by the association as the Committee on Nominations for 1916: Professor Frank M. Anderson, chairman, Dr. Lois K. Mathews, Professor Edmond S. Meany, President Charles H. Rammelkamp, and Mr. Alfred H. Stone. The Association then adjourned, to meet in Cincinnati at the end of next December.

Such were in bare outline the proceedings of the business meeting. Many details can be filled in from the votes and proposals textually quoted in appendixes to this article. But more memorable, and more important to the future of the Association than any specific measures, was the spirit which pervaded the meeting, and the impressive demonstration of the society's abiding unity and harmony. The presence of more than four hundred keenly in-

terested members in a business meeting was in itself a gratifying sight, well worth some gropings in procedure, and contrasting strongly with the small and lifeless though mechanically correct meetings which have been frequent. More valuable still, it was clearly shown that there are and have been no parties in the Association, though there have been all gradations of opinion, from the ultra-conservative to the ultra-radical. It was amply shown, on the one hand, that even those who most earnestly desired the introduction of a democratic order were disposed, with exceptions so few in number as to be negligible, to seek that end without imputing misconduct or self-seeking to those who have held office or conducted affairs under the old régime. On the other hand, it was made clear that those who saw little occasion for reorganization, and still less for calling it by the censorious name of reform, were able to defer with composure to the wishes of others, and to take their part loyally and serenely in the reshaping of institutions and practice. In short, it was demonstrated that a great society of historical scholars was able, as it ought to be able if historical training has anything of the value attributed to it, to pass through these "growing pains" from adolescence to maturity without loss of moderation, just feeling, or urbanity.

What interpretation should be placed upon this whole episode of transition will be clearer ten years from now than it can be to-day. Yet it seems likely that the man of 1926, or the observer from Mars, would declare it to be little other than a natural stage in the evolution of large scientific societies. Parallel instances in the history of other such societies, they would affirm, have not been lacking. It is natural for such societies to be for considerable periods managed by a small number of those most interested. The American Historical Association, they might say, was managed by a much smaller number of persons before 1896 than at any time thereafter. That even in the subsequent years its affairs were mainly conducted by a moderate number of members was, they might maintain, a régime justified by the acquiescence or indifference of the majority, so long as elections were unconstrained and business was managed with efficiency and in no other interest than that of the whole membership; but whenever that acquiescence should become impaired, on the part of even a considerable minority, or whenever indifference should be brought to an end by any causes that should arouse a wider interest among the members, no effort should be made to maintain the old régime, lest it become an unrepresentative oligarchy. The way should be left wide open, they would declare, for a thorough democratization of rules and practice, in accordance with new

states of mind on the part of the membership. And such indeed, they might well affirm, had been the constant attitude of the existing Executive Council. That attitude was justly described in these pages a year ago (XX. 523) as "the obvious desire of the Council to place itself at the disposal of the Association". "No other attitude", it was added, "is proper, and no other was suggested in the [then recent] meeting of the Council".

Similarly, with respect to the relations of the Association to this journal, there is no occasion to modify the expressions used a year ago (XX. 525) as to the willingness of the Board of Editors to fall in with any plan of organization which might seem to serve better the interests of its readers and of the historical profession, in so far as these are represented in the Association. The transfer of ownership to the Association was readily and unanimously agreed to by the Board, and it will co-operate loyally in working out the details. If no very solid reasons for making the transfer have been advanced, excepting that the Association plainly desires it, that desire itself is, to any considerate mind, a very solid reason.

J. F. J.

#### VOTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, DECEMBER 27 AND 28, 1915

The following estimate of expenditures for 1916 was approved.

Expenses of Administration:		\$2,025.00
Secretary and treasurer .....	\$1,500.00	
Secretary of the Council .....	50.00	
Executive Council .....	300.00	
Committee on Nominations.....	25.00	
Miscellaneous .....	150.00	
Annual Meetings:		125.00
Committee on Programme, 1915.....	50.00	
Committee on Programme, 1916.....	50.00	
Conference of Historical Societies.....	25.00	
Publications:		1,597.73
Committee on Publications .....	797.73	
Editorial work .....	200.00	
Cumulative index to <i>Papers and Reports</i> .....	600.00	
<i>American Historical Review</i> .....		4,560.00
Standing Committees:		240.00
Public Archives Commission .....	100.00	
General Committee .....	75.00	
Committee on Bibliography .....	25.00	
Committee on History in Schools .....	40.00	
Prizes and Subventions:		750.00
Justin Winsor Prize (1914) .....	150.00	
<i>Writings on American History</i> .....	200.00	
<i>History Teacher's Magazine</i> .....	400.00	
Expenses of Committee of Nine .....		225.00
		\$9,522.73

Mr. Ephraim Emerton was elected a member of the Board of Editors of the *American Historical Review* for two years from January 1, 1916, to fill the unexpired term of Mr. George L. Burr, resigned.

Mr. Claude H. Van Tyne was elected a member of the Board of Editors of the *Review* to serve six years from January 1, 1916.

It was voted to create a standing Committee of the Council on Finance, to consist of the secretaries, the treasurer, and two other members of the Council.

It was voted to rescind the vote of the Council of December 30, 1901, assigning to the secretary of the Association the duty of editing the annual reports and that hereafter the work of editing the annual reports and the prize essays be performed under the direction of the Publication Committee.

It was voted that the treasurer be instructed to rule that payments to members of the Association for travelling expenses incurred in attending meetings of committees shall, unless otherwise ordered by the Council, cover transportation and Pullman fares only.

It was voted that the treasurer is authorized to pay no travelling expenses of any member, board, or committee on account of meetings of such boards and committees held at the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association.

#### VOTES OF THE ASSOCIATION IN BUSINESS MEETING

*Voted*, That a Finance Committee of three, not members of the Executive Council, be selected by the Association to examine and report on the finances of the Association at the next annual meeting.

*Voted*, That the January and subsequent issues of the *Review* will not be sent to members until their current dues are paid. Members whose dues remain unpaid after June 1 will not be carried upon the roll of the Association, but they may be reinstated at any time thereafter upon payment of the dues then current.

*Voted*, That in view of the present financial condition of the Association, payments for travelling expenses, authorized by vote of the Association on December 29, 1902,<sup>1</sup> are limited for the present to transportation and Pullman fares.

*Resolved*, That the attacks made during the last year upon the character and motives of certain prominent and honored members of this Association meet with our entire disapproval, and that we hereby express our full confidence in the men whose motives and conduct have been thus impugned.

*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of the Association that full ownership and control of the *American Historical Review* should be vested in the Association, but that the present connection of the said *Review* with the Carnegie Institution of Washington and with the Macmillan Company, publishers, be continued.

*Resolved*, That the president, the first vice-president, the secretary of the Council, the secretary of the Association, and the treasurer be instructed to ascertain what arrangements can be made to effect that end, and report at the next annual meeting of the Association.

*Voted*, That the procedure as to nominations which was adopted for

<sup>1</sup> A vote providing for the payment of travelling expenses of members of the Council attending the November meeting.

the year 1915 at the last annual meeting of the Association be followed for the year 1916.<sup>2</sup>

SUMMARY OF TREASURER'S REPORT

December 21, 1915

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand December 23, 1914 .....	\$ 2,382.96
Annual dues .....	8,234.13
Dividend on bank stock .....	200.00
Interest on bond and mortgage .....	900.00
Loan, C. W. Bowen .....	625.00
Publications .....	872.38
From Board of Editors of <i>American Historical Review</i> .....	400.00
Miscellaneous .....	122.05
	<u>\$13,736.52</u>

DISBURSEMENTS

Expense of Administration:

Offices of secretary and treasurer .....	\$2,080.91
Secretary of the Council .....	68.52
Executive Council .....	352.51
Miscellaneous .....	165.90
Payment of loan .....	625.00
London headquarters .....	100.00
Pacific Coast Branch .....	72.24

3,465.08

Annual Meetings:

Thirtieth .....	46.40
Thirty-first .....	309.73

356.13

Publications:

Committee on Publications .....	852.13
Editorial services .....	300.00
General Index to <i>Papers and Reports</i> .....	500.00

1,652.13

*American Historical Review*:

4,403.20

Standing Committees:

Historical Manuscripts Commission .....	57.65
Public Archives Commission .....	150.00
General Committee .....	15.64
Committee on Bibliography .....	56.26
Committee on History in Schools .....	112.63

392.18

Prizes and Subventions:

Justin Winsor Prize Committee .....	13.72
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize Committee ....	200.00
<i>Writings on American History</i> .....	200.00
<i>History Teacher's Magazine</i> .....	400.00

813.72

Balance on hand December 21, 1915 .....

\$11,082.44

2,654.08

\$13,736.52

<sup>2</sup> The procedure was described in this journal a year ago (XX. 523-524).



## ASSETS

Bond and mortgage on real estate .....	\$20,000.00
Accrued interest on above .....	208.07
Twenty shares American Exchange National Bank stock .....	4,200.00
Cash on hand .....	2,654.08
	<hr/> \$27,062.15

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE OF NINE

[*Respecting the constitution.*] That the following article be substituted for article IV. of the present constitution:

## (IV.)

The officers shall be a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary, a secretary of the council, a curator, and a treasurer. These officers shall be elected by ballot at each regular annual meeting in the manner provided in the by-laws.

That the following article be substituted for article V. of the present constitution:

## (V.)

There shall be an Executive Council constituted as follows:

- (1) The officers named in article IV.;
- (2) Elected members, eight in number, to be chosen annually in the same manner as the officers of the Association;
- (3) The former presidents, but a former president shall be entitled to vote for the three years succeeding the expiration of his term as president, and no longer.

That a new article be adopted, numbered VI., as follows:

## (VI.)

The Executive Council shall conduct the business, manage the property, and care for the general interests of the Association. In the exercise of its proper functions, the Council may appoint such committees, commissions, and boards as it may deem necessary. The Council shall make a full report of its activities to the annual meeting of the Association. The Association may by vote at any annual meeting instruct the Executive Council to discontinue or enter upon any activity, and may take such other action in directing the affairs of the Association as it may deem necessary and proper.

That article VI. of the existing constitution be re-numbered VII.

(*All the above, in accordance with article VI. of the existing constitution, were referred to the next annual meeting.*)

[*Respecting by-laws.*] Your committee recommends the adoption of the following by-laws:

- (1) The officers provided for by the constitution shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attaching to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.
- (2) A nomination committee of five members shall be chosen at each annual meeting in the manner hereafter provided for the election of

officers of the Association. At such convenient time prior to the first of October as it may determine it shall invite every member to express to it his preference regarding every office to be filled by election at the ensuing annual meeting and regarding the composition of the new nominating committee then to be chosen. It shall publish and mail to each member at least twenty days prior to the annual meeting such nominations as it may determine upon for each elective office and for the next nominating committee. It shall prepare for use at the annual meeting an official ballot containing, as candidates for each office or committee membership to be filled thereat, the names of its nominees and also the names of any other nominees which may be proposed to the chairman of the committee in writing by twenty or more members of the Association at least five days before the annual meeting. The official ballot shall also provide, under each office, a blank space for voting for such further nominees as any member may present from the floor at the time of the election.

(3) The annual election of officers and the choice of a nominating committee for the ensuing year shall be conducted by the use of an official ballot prepared as described in by-law two.

(4) The Association authorizes the payment of travelling expenses incurred by the voting members of the Council attending one meeting of that body a year, this meeting to be other than that held in connection with the annual meeting of the Association.

*(All the above were referred to the next annual meeting.)*

[*Respecting procedure.*] Your committee suggests:

*First*, that to the business meeting, including the election, there should be given a full half-day, as in this year's programme;

*Secondly*, that, as was done at Chicago, the minutes of the Council should be printed and distributed at or before the business meeting;

*Thirdly*, that written reports from standing committees and commissions, showing in full the work accomplished, and in detail the expense incurred, should be made in writing to the Council at least two weeks before the annual meeting, should be held by the secretary of the Association at his office, and at the place of the annual meeting, during its continuance, subject to inspection by any member, and should be read in the business meeting by title only unless the reading of the full report be called for by ten members present, or directed by the Council;

*Fourthly*, that, on the other hand, new activities and all matters in which there is reason to suppose that the Association takes a special interest, should be somewhat fully presented by the Council at the business meeting.

The purpose of these recommendations is, on the one hand, to give members an opportunity of keeping acquainted with the work of the Association, its Council and committees, and, on the other, to free the business meetings of unnecessary detail.

Since only a minority of the members of the Association ever attend the business meetings, we also suggest that it would be well if the abstracts of proceedings prepared by the secretary and the secretary of the Council for printing in the *Annual Report* could contain more extended information than hitherto concerning the Association's activities aside from the historical papers read at the meetings.

*(The above were adopted forthwith by the Association.)*

[*Respecting the American Historical Review.*] Your committee recommends that the Association adopt the following resolutions:

(1) *Resolved*, That it is the opinion of the Association that full ownership and control of the *American Historical Review* should be vested in the Association.

(2) *Resolved*, That the president, the first vice-president, the secretary of the Council, the secretary of the Association, and the treasurer be instructed to make such arrangements as may be necessary to that end, and be authorized to enter into such arrangements and agreements as may be requisite for the publication and management of the *Review*, until final action is taken by the Council.

(*Modified forms of the above were adopted by the Association; see the fifth and sixth paragraphs of its votes quoted above, p. 462.*)

#### OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

*President*, George L. Burr, Ithaca, N. Y.

*First Vice-President*, Worthington C. Ford, Boston.

*Second Vice-President*, William Roscoe Thayer, Cambridge.

*Secretary*, Waldo G. Leland, Carnegie Institution, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.

*Treasurer*, Clarence W. Bowen of New York (address 1140 Woodward Building, Washington).

*Secretary to the Council*, Evarts B. Greene, Urbana, Ill.

*Curator*, A. Howard Clark, Smithsonian Institution.

*Executive Council* (in addition to the above-named officers):

Andrew D. White,<sup>1</sup>

James B. Angell,<sup>1</sup>

Henry Adams,<sup>1</sup>

James Schouler,<sup>1</sup>

James Ford Rhodes,<sup>1</sup>

John B. McMaster,<sup>1</sup>

Simeon E. Baldwin,<sup>1</sup>

J. Franklin Jameson,<sup>1</sup>

George B. Adams,<sup>1</sup>

Albert Bushnell Hart,<sup>1</sup>

Frederick J. Turner,<sup>1</sup>

William M. Sloane,<sup>1</sup>

Theodore Roosevelt,<sup>1</sup>

William A. Dunning,<sup>1</sup>

Andrew C. McLaughlin,<sup>1</sup>

H. Morse Stephens,<sup>1</sup>

Eugene C. Barker,

Guy S. Ford,

Samuel B. Harding,

Charles H. Haskins,

Ulrich B. Phillips,

Lucy M. Salmon.

#### *Committees:*

*Committee on Programme for the Thirty-second Annual Meeting:*

Henry E. Bourne, chairman; Frank M. Anderson, Wilbur H. Siebert, Edward R. Turner, Merrick Whitcomb, James A. Woodburn.

*Committee on Local Arrangements:* Charles P. Taft, chairman; Charles T. Greve, vice-chairman; Isaac J. Cox, secretary; Charles W. Dabney, Judson Harmon, H. C. Hollister, H. B. Mackoy, Philip V. N. Myers, T. C. Powell, W. P. Rogers, John L. Shearer, with power to add to their membership.

*Committee on Nominations:* Frank M. Anderson, Dartmouth College; Mrs. Lois K. Mathews, University of Wisconsin; Edmond S. Meany, University of Washington; Charles H. Rammelkamp, Illinois College; Alfred H. Stone, Dunleith, Miss.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-presidents.

- Editors of the American Historical Review:* Edward P. Cheyney, chairman; Carl Becker, Ephraim Emerton, J. Franklin Jameson, James H. Robinson, Claude H. Van Tyne.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Gaillard Hunt, Library of Congress, chairman; Charles H. Ambler, Herbert E. Bolton, Milo M. Quaife, William O. Scroggs, Justin H. Smith.
- Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Carl R. Fish, University of Wisconsin, chairman; George L. Beer, Allen Johnson, Everett Kimball, Orin G. Libby.
- Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Laurence M. Larson, University of Illinois, chairman; Sidney B. Fay, Louis J. Paetow, Ruth Putnam, William R. Shepherd.
- Public Archives Commission:* Victor H. Paltsits, chairman; Clarence W. Alvord, Solon J. Buck, John C. Fitzpatrick, George S. Godard, Charles Moore, Thomas M. Owen.
- Committee on Bibliography:* George M. Dutcher, chairman; William T. Laprade, Albert H. Lybyer, Wallace Notestein, William W. Rockwell, Augustus H. Shearer, William A. Slade, Bernard T. Steiner.
- Committee on Publications:* Henry B. Learned, Washington, chairman; and (*ex officio*) George M. Dutcher, Carl R. Fish, Evarts B. Greene, Gaillard Hunt, J. Franklin Jameson, Laurence M. Larson, Waldo G. Leland, Victor H. Paltsits.
- General Committee:* William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Arthur I. Andrews, William K. Boyd, James M. Callahan, Clarence E. Carter, Isaac J. Cox, Eloise Ellery, Evarts B. Greene, Waldo G. Leland, Robert M. McElroy, William A. Morris, Irene T. Myers, Edmund S. Noyes, Paul F. Peck, Morgan P. Robinson, Royal B. Way.
- Committee on a Bibliography of Modern English History:* Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Conyers Read.
- Committee on History in Schools:* William S. Ferguson, Harvard University, chairman; Victoria A. Adams, Henry E. Bourne, Henry L. Cannon, Edgar Dawson, Oliver M. Dickerson, Herbert D. Foster, Samuel B. Harding, Margaret McGill, Robert A. Maurer, Nathaniel W. Stephenson.
- Conference of Historical Societies:* Chairman to be selected by the programme committee; Augustus H. Shearer, secretary.
- Advisory Board of the History Teacher's Magazine:* Henry Johnson, Teachers College, chairman; Fred M. Fling, James Sullivan, Anna B. Thompson (these four hold over); Frederic Duncalf, O. H. Williams (these two elected for three years).
- Committee on the Military History Prize:* Captain Arthur L. Conger, U. S. A., Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, chairman; Milledge L. Bonham, jr., Allen R. Boyd, Fred M. Fling, Albert Bushnell Hart.
- Committee on Finance:* Cheesman A. Herrick, Girard College, Philadelphia, chairman; Howard L. Gray, Arthur C. Howland.